



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,197	10/01/2003	Timothy A. Timmins	41698.1104	7119
7590	06/01/2006		EXAMINER	
ALEX L. YIP KAYE SCHOLER LLP 425 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022			ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/676,197	TIMMINS, TIMOTHY A.	
	Examiner Md S. Elahee	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 10/31/2005. Claims 1-49 are pending. Claims 31-49 have been added.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/31/2005 Remarks have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 33, 35-37, 41-43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ala-Laurila (U.S. 6,246,871).

Regarding claim 33, Ala-Laurila teaches with respect to figures 1, 2, a method for storing and disseminating information, the method comprising:

receiving by a system information found by a user independently of the system, with personal password [i.e., data identifying the user] (col.2, lines 9-11, col.3, lines 53-60);

storing the received information in association with personal password [i.e., data identifying the user] (col.3, lines 53-60); and disseminating the stored information to a recipient (col.4, lines 61-64).

Regarding claim 35, Ala-Laurila teaches the user sending the information to the system via a communications network (col.2, lines 11-15).

Regarding claim 36, Ala-Laurila teaches disseminating the stored information to a recipient [i.e., third party] (col.4, lines 47-52).

Regarding claims 37, 43, Ala-Laurila teaches disseminating the stored information to the third party at the request of the user (col.4, lines 47-64).

Regarding claims 39, 45, Ala-Laurila teaches that the stored data is a website link (col.5, lines 14-16).

Regarding claim 40, Ala-Laurila teaches sending the website link to the third party (col.5, lines 14-20).

Claims 41, 42 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 33. Furthermore, Ala-Laurila teaches network message database 34 [i.e., memory] (fig.1);

a processor configured to:
receive information found by a user independently of the system, with data identifying
the user (col.2, lines 9-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 1-5, 6, 7, 10-17, 20, 31, 32, 34, 38, 44 and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila (U.S. 6,246,871) in view of Hartselle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,888,930).

Regarding claims 1, 34, 47, 49, Ala-Laurila teaches storing in the repository the desired information from the third party [i.e., information source], the information source being directed to send the desired information to the system via a communications network (fig.1; col.2, lines 9-11, col.3, lines 39-43);

the desired information being associated with personal password [i.e., data identifying the user] (col.2, lines 9-11, col.3, lines 53-60);

conveying temporary password to the one or more parties (col.4, lines 16-32).

However, Ala-Laurila does not specifically teach conveying the identifying data to the one or more parties. Ala-Laurila teaches that subscriber personal password can be used to access temporary messages (col.4, lines 2-5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila to convey the identifying data to the one or more parties in order to deliver all the desired messages to multiple recipients.

allowing access by the one or more parties to the desired information in the repository based on the identifying data (col.4, lines 61-64).

Ala-Laurila does not specifically teach “the user searching an information source remote from the system for the desired information”. Hartselle teaches the user searching an information source remote from the system for the desired information (col.12, lines 20-31). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila to allow the user searching an information source remote from the system for the desired information in order to deliver desired information obtained from third party system by a caller to a particular recipient.

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Ala-Laurila teaches that the repository is accessed through a mail server 30 [i.e., information assistance service] (fig.1).

Regarding claims 3 and 13, Ala-Laurila teaches that the repository is accessed via a telephone (col.4, lines 61-64).

Regarding claims 4 and 14, Ala-Laurila teaches that the repository is accessible via the Internet (col.5, lines 14-20).

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Ala-Laurila does not specifically teach “the information source is accessible via the Internet”. Hartselle teaches that the information source is accessible via the Internet (col.12, lines 28-31). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila to allow the information source being accessible via the Internet as taught by Hartselle. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to use internet access to retrieve desired message by a caller at a lower cost.

Regarding claims 6 and 16, Ala-Laurila does not specifically teach “the information source is accessible via a telephone”. Hartselle teaches that the information source is accessible via a telephone (col.12, lines 56-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila to allow the information source being accessible via a telephone as taught by Hartselle. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to use mobile telephone to retrieve desired message by a caller without using any computer.

Regarding claim 7, Ala-Laurila teaches allowing the user to access the desired information in the repository (col.3, lines 53-60).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Ala-Laurila teaches that the system uses the identifying data to recognize the one or more parties when accessing the information in the repository (col.4, lines 61-64).

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Ala-Laurila teaches maintaining at the repository data identifying a user (col.3, lines 51-60).

releasing the information to selected recipients based on instructions from the user that include the identifying data (col.4, lines 16-32).

Regarding claim 17, Ala-Laurila teaches using the identifying data to recognize the user when the user accesses the information at the repository (col.3, lines 53-60).

Claims 31, 46 and 48 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 33, and 41.

Regarding claim 32, Ala-Laurila teaches that the processor is configured to receive the information from a third party [i.e., source separate] from the system (col.2, lines 9-11).

Claims 38, 44 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 37.

8. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Hartselle et al. further in view of Lambiase (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,477).

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Ala-Laurila in view of Hartselle fails to teach “the user is recognized by the system using an automatic number identification (ANI)”. Lambiase teaches that the user is recognized by the system using an automatic number identification (ANI) (col.5, line 67-col.6, line 4). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila in view of Hartselle to allow the user being recognized by the system using an automatic number identification (ANI) as taught by Lambiase. The motivation for the modification is to locate the record of a user.

9. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Hartselle et al. further in view of May (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,480).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Ala-Laurila in view of Hartselle fails to teach “the user is recognized by the system using the user's voiceprint”. May teaches that the USER1 [i.e., user] is recognized by the system using the user's voiceprint (col.6, lines 33, 34). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila in view of Hartselle to allow the user being recognized by the system using the user's

voiceprint as taught by May. The motivation for the modification is to identify caller using his speech.

10. Claims 21-27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila (U.S. 6,246,871) in view of Handel et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0035501).

Claim 21 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 11. Furthermore, Ala-Laurila does not specifically teach “a gateway for maintaining data identifying a user”. Handel teaches a profile gateway server [i.e., gateway] for maintaining data identifying a user (fig.17; page 23, paragraph 0179). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila to allow a gateway for maintaining data identifying a user as taught by Handel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide service to the profile owner.

Ala-Laurila does not specifically teach “an interface for receiving information from an information source”. Handel teaches an interface for receiving information from an information source (fig.17; page 23, paragraph 0179). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila to allow an interface for receiving information from an information source as taught by Handel. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to deliver desired information obtained from server to the user.

Regarding claims 22-27 and 30 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 17 and 10.

11. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Handel et al. further in view of Lambiase (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,477).

Regarding claim 28, Ala-Laurila in view of Handel fails to teach “the user is recognized by the system using an automatic number identification (ANI)”. Lambiase teaches that the user is recognized by the system using an automatic number identification (ANI) (col.5, line 67-col.6, line 4). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila in view of Handel to allow the user being recognized by the system using an automatic number identification (ANI) as taught by Lambiase. The motivation for the modification is to locate the record of a user.

12. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Handel et al. further in view of May (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,480).

Regarding claim 29, Ala-Laurila in view of Handel fails to teach “the user is recognized by the system using the user's voiceprint”. May teaches that the USER1 [i.e., user] is recognized by the system using the user's voiceprint (col.6, lines 33, 34). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila in view of Handel to allow the user being recognized by the system using the user's voiceprint as taught by May. The motivation for the modification is to identify caller using his speech.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Elsey et al. (U.S. 2005/0004934) teach Technique for effectively collecting and analyzing data in providing information assistance services,

Silverman (U.S. 6,226,668) teach Method and apparatus for web messaging,

Anderson (U.S. 6,442,600) teach Method and system for centralized storage and management of electronic messages,

Foladare et al. (U.S. 6,373,926) teach Centralized message service apparatus and method and

Gregory et al. (U.S. 6,970,535) teach Wireless messaging system to multiple recipients.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2614

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ME

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
May 28, 2006



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600